

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Cheryl Woodley,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	Civil Action No. 2:20-cv-1273-BHH
v.)	
)	
iQor, and Courtney King,)	
)	<u>ORDER</u>
Defendants.)	
)	

This matter is before the Court upon Plaintiff's complaint filed pursuant to Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. On September 16, 2020, Defendants filed a motion to dismiss. Plaintiff did not file a response to the motion.

In accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Civil Rule 73.02(B)(2)(d) (D.S.C.), the matter was referred to a United States Magistrate Judge for preliminary determinations. On November 16, 2020, Magistrate Judge Mary Gordon Baker issued a report and recommendation ("Report") outlining the issues and recommending that the Court dismiss this action with prejudice for lack of prosecution and for failure to comply with the Court's orders, pursuant to Rule 41(b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and the factors outlined in *Chandler Leasing Corp. v. Lopez*, 669 F.2d 919, 920 (4th Cir. 1982). Attached to the Magistrate Judge's Report was a notice advising Plaintiff of his right to file written objections to the Report within fourteen days of being served with a copy. To date, no objections have been filed.

The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to the Court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight, and the responsibility to make a final determination remains with the Court. *Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261 (1976). The Court

is charged with making a *de novo* determination only of those portions of the Report to which specific objections are made, and the Court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendation of the Magistrate Judge, or recommit the matter to the Magistrate Judge with instructions. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). In the absence of specific objections, the Court reviews the matter only for clear error. *See Diamond v. Colonial Life & Accident Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005) (stating that “in the absence of a timely filed objection, a district court need not conduct a *de novo* review, but instead must ‘only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.’”) (quoting Fed. R. Civ. P. 72 advisory committee’s note).

Here, because no objections were filed, the Court has reviewed the record, the applicable law, and the findings and recommendations of the Magistrate Judge for clear error. After review, the Court finds no clear error and agrees with the Magistrate Judge’s findings and analysis. Accordingly, because it appears that Plaintiff no longer wishes to pursue this action, the Court adopts the Magistrate Judge’s Report (ECF No. 35) and incorporates it herein, and the Court dismisses this action with prejudice for lack of prosecution and for failure to comply with the Court’s orders, pursuant to Rule 41(b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and the factors outlined in *Chandler Leasing Corp. v. Lopez*, 669 F.2d at 920.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

/s/Bruce H. Hendricks
The Honorable Bruce Howe Hendricks
United States District Judge

December 17, 2020
Charleston, South Carolina